

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 6-8, 13 and 15 have been amended. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the subject matter. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ong (U.S. Patent Pub No. 2002/0156800), hereafter “Ong.” Applicant asserts that Ong does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 8 and 15, Applicant submits that Ong fails to teach or suggest providing milestones at predetermined locations within a workflow of the application, each milestone comprising a checkpoint in the runtime execution of the application. Rather, the passage of Ong cited by the Office describes storing a date stamp with a web page to distinguish it from other web pages. However, the date stamp of Ong is involved merely with static data storage and, as such, is not a checkpoint in the runtime execution of an application.

In contrast, the claimed invention includes “...providing milestones at predetermined locations within a workflow of the application, each milestone comprising a checkpoint in the runtime execution of the application.” Claim 1. As such, the milestones of the claimed

invention are not merely date stamps to distinguish static data files as is the date stamp in Ong, but rather comprise a checkpoint in the runtime execution of the application. Thus, the date stamp of Ong does not teach the milestones of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claims 1, 8 and 15, Applicant respectfully submits that Ong also fails to teach or suggest automatically transporting the user to the particular milestone when the user logs into the application. The Office admits that Ong does not teach this feature of the claimed invention, but states that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a conventional login/authentication function in practicing Ong’s invention.” Office Action, page 3. Applicant asserts that the Office’s unsupported factual statement amounts to Official Notice, Applicant further asserts that the Office’s factual assertion is not properly based upon common knowledge. For example, Applicant asserts that the automatic transporting of a user to a milestone within the runtime execution of an application upon login is not obvious to one skilled in the art as asserted by the Office. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office support the finding with references that show these features or withdraw the rejection.

With respect to newly amended claims 6 and 13, Applicant respectfully submits that Ong also does not teach or suggest that the associating step is performed in response to completion by the user of a task in the workflow corresponding to the particular workflow. Further, with respect to newly amended claim 7, Applicant respectfully submits that Ong fails to teach or suggest deleting all associations upon completion of the workflow by the user. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.


With respect to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Date: August 24, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew